UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,705	05/18/2006	Joseph Kennedy	089498.0482.US	2929
³⁹⁹⁰⁵ Joseph J. Crima	7590 01/19/201 ı ldi	1	EXAMINER	
Roetzel & Andress			ZEMEL, IRINA SOPJIA	
222 S. Main St. Akron, OH 443			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1765	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/19/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Owners	10/561,705	KENNEDY ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Irina S. Zemel	1765	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address -	r=
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING [2] - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period above, the province of t	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communica (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 c 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under 	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr		s is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/a	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct should be shown to be shown that are shown in the shown in the shown that are shown that are shown that are shown in the shown that are shown that	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). njected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) ☐ Notice of Informal I 6) ☐ Other:	ate	

DETAILED ACTION

The rejections not addressed below are deemed withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-12, 14-26, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 0949 282 to Kaneka Corporation, (hereinafter "Kaneka '282").

The rejection stands are per reasons of record set for the in the previous office action and incorporated herein by reference. As discussed in the previous office action, the reference not only expressly discloses norbornene as a suitable cationically polymerizable monomer for the second block, (which is now deleted from the scope of the claims), the reference further expressly discloses suitability of dicyclopentadiene for forming the other (non-isobutylene) polymer block. Cationic polymerization of dicyclopentadiene results in polymer corresponding to the last formula recited in claims 1 and 20.

In addition, the reference expressly discloses ethylidene norbornene as a suitable monomer, i.e., a compound structurally similar to another claimed polycycloolefin from norbornadiene monomer group (as term norbornadiene is defined by the applicants), which represents yet another at least homologue obvious structural units to the claimed cycloolefin segments.

The invention as claimed, thus is fully within the purview of the cited reference, and clearly discloses each and every claimed element thus anticipating the claimed invention..

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 6,8,13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneka '282.

The rejection stands as per reasons of record set for the in the previous office action and incorporated herein by reference.

Claims 1, 7, 9-11 are under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,804,664 to Kennedy et al., (hereinafter "Kennedy '664") in combination with Kaneka '282.

The disclosure of Kennedy is discussed indetail in the previous office actions. While expressly disclosing norbornene or pinene as suitable monomers for the second stage polymerization, the reference does not disclose "norbornadiene" monomers that results in now claimed structures. However, the reference states that "[a]ny cationic polymerizable monomer substantially incompatible with the monomer used in the first addition polymerization can be added to form the block copolymer" (col. 9, lines 23-26).

Kaneka '282 discloses a wide variety of monomers that can be cationically polymerized to form a block with polyisobutylene block, including the monomers disclosed by Kennedy and also monomers that result in "norbornadiene" segments upon polymerization such as dicyclopnetadiene or ethylidene norbornene. Therefore,

Art Unit: 1765

use of such monomers for the second addition polymerization of Kennedy would have been obvious with reasonable expectation of success in view of express teachings of Kennedy of suitability of any cationic polymerizable monomer substantially incompatible with the monomer used in the first addition polymerization can be added to form the block copolymer, and also in view of the teachings of Kaneka '282 sdisclosing suitability of specifically claimed monomers for cationic co-polymerization with PIP blocks.

It is expressly noted that no unexpected results that can be attributed to the presence of either one of three recited cycloolefin segments (especially as compared to now deleted norbornene) is presented on the record.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7-19-2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicants make the same arguments with respect to the rejections based on either one EP '282 or Kennedy as the primary reference. The applicants state that the primary references do not disclose the invention as claimed in the rending claims, specifically that the references do not teach blocks based on norbornadiene monomer compound. As discussed above, this is not so since the EP '282 (Kaneka '282) reference expressly teaches at least dicyclopentadiene as one of the suitable polymerizable monomers, which compound (expressly included by the applicants in the "norbornadiene" class of compounds as per instant claims) fully correspond to the last compound disclosed on page 6 of the instant application, resulting, upon polymerization, in the last compound claimed in claims 1 and 13. compound. In

addition, the reference also discloses ethylidenenorbornene, which is a homologue of another (third) compound expressly disclosed in the instant specification. Therefore, as discussed above, the invention as claimed is still considered to have been obvious from the disclosure of the cited references (alone or in combination as set forth above.)

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Irina S. Zemel whose telephone number is (571)272-0577. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on (571)272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ Irina S. Zemel/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1765 Irina S. Zemel Primary Examiner Art Unit 1765 Application/Control Number: 10/561,705

Page 6

Art Unit: 1765